

The people out in the districts and the Governors are not heartless people. They want their kids to get nutritious meals as well. I think this is a good plan. I think it is a first step. I think once we get more of these facts out here—as I say, if I did not know that we were spending 30 percent more than the President requested, if I did not know that as a Member of Congress until tonight, I will guarantee you that an awful lot of American people did not know that but they are going to know it sooner or later.

Thomas Jefferson perhaps said it best. "Give the American people the truth and the Republic will be saved." All we really have to do is get the facts out about this program. I think the American people will see the wisdom of it. I think it is a good plan. We ought to pass it.

I hope colleagues will join us in this because if the American people get the facts about this, they will buy into this idea.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me quickly say that I again do not argue with somebody's philosophy. If they have a philosophical difference, that is fine. If they believe one size fits all, that is fine. I do not happen to have that philosophy. If they believe that the Federal Government has all the answers to all the problems, I do not have any problem with their philosophy. I do not agree with it, but I do not have any problem with it. That is their philosophy.

If they believe that we have helped those on welfare in the last 35 years, go on dreaming. I do not happen to believe that. The only thing I request is, please read the legislation and then discuss the legislation.

Mr. President, we are not cutting and gutting school lunch and child nutrition programs. We are cutting bureaucracy. We want to grow healthy children. We are not trying to grow healthy or unhealthy bureaucracies. And so I hope that everyone from the Commander in Chief on down will read what is in H.R. 999 so that they actually can participate in a debate intelligently and talk about the facts. And again, as you pointed out over and over again, we are doing better to grow healthy children than the President has recommended.

I appreciate all of your participation this evening and I hope that the public has been listening and I hope that they will now better understand what the existing program is and what we are doing in the future to try to change to make sure that more children have an opportunity and more pregnant women have an opportunity to participate in nutritious meals programs.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-78) on the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PEACE, JUSTICE, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, no discussion is more important than the one that is now under way here in Washington concerning the budget and all matters related to fiscal appropriations policies. The discussion that we have just heard is a very vital one. It relates to one small facet of the total budget and one small portion of the Contract With America.

The question of school lunches and whether they have been cut or not has been thoroughly discussed and we will have some more discussion on it. It is very important because in the process of trying to save money on school lunches, there has been some trickery. We are moving under the cover of a block grant and we are talking about giving additional money to take care of inflation. We are not discussing the fact that an entitlement is being taken away, an entitlement.

Every hungry child who has a certain income level is entitled now to a free lunch, which means that no matter how large that number increases and how great it becomes, the free lunch will always be there for the hungry child. In the block grant process, there is a finite number of children who can be fed. The Federal Government has only provided a finite amount of money. There is no supplementary budget at the Federal level that you can fall back on. You cannot go to the treasury of the Federal Government. They have washed their hands of the process once they give the block grant. So it is up to the States. It is up to the local government to pick up at that point and that is a part of the discussion. We can talk more and more about that but it is only a small part of the total picture.

Let us not talk so much about what has been cut so far, although that is important, the fact that school lunches are on the block and they are being squeezed in devious ways to save money. The fact that the summer youth employment programs, one of

the most basic, practical, and concrete programs ever devised by the Federal Government where teenagers are employed during the summer, that also is on the chopping block.

In the rescission process, they have put zero in the budget for the remainder of this year, reached into the current budget, money that has already been authorized, programs that have already been authorized, money that has already been appropriated is now being taken out of the current budget for the year which ends on September 30, 1995. That is called a rescission process. It is a cruel process of having people who anticipate that they are going to get certain kinds of programs and funding suddenly wake up and discover that it has been snatched away in this budget year, before we get to the process of the next budget year, 1996 budget year, which begins October 1, 1995.

So we are cutting programs which have relatively small amounts of money attached to them when you look at the total budget and benefit large numbers of people, programs that have been demonstrated to be workable, programs which go straight to the heart of the matter and serve the poorest people in the country. We are cutting them, and one of the questions is, why are we cutting these programs and not cutting other programs? And I will get to that later.

I think it is important to understand that the budget-making process is a vital part of a bigger process whereby we are defining our vision for America as we see it, as we go forward the year 2000 and beyond.

□ 2130

What happens this year will determine what is going to be happening in the next 10 to 20 years. This is a pivotal year. It is a pivotal year because the majority in the Congress that has just taken over has made it a pivotal year, and we should not back away from the challenge of making a lot of very basic decisions which will set the course of America for the next 10 to 20 years. We will not back away from it. Let us just understand that everything that is being done; those things that have dollars attached to them, and many of them that do not have dollars attached to them, are a part of a process to prepare America for a future that is going to be a future basically to serve a small elite group of people or a future America that belongs to everybody. I say it is a conflict, a battle, between the oppressive elite minority and the caring majority. I think there is definitely a cleavage here, unlike any we have seen before.

There is a group, which I call the oppressive elite minority, who have a great deal of education, a great deal of understanding about how to use power. They have a great knowledge of how to use information. They know how to control and make very good use of

media. But the oppressive elite minority is lacking in compassion. The oppressive elite minority has a distorted vision of what America should be all about. This oppressive elite minority, in charge of Congress now, has a vision which seeks to throw certain groups of people overboard. It has a mentality of triage. It is basically saying that there are some things that are not in the American dream for all people. In fact only a small group should benefit.

This kind of philosophy is a distortion, in my opinion, of where we ought to go. It is the wrong vision. They are clear on where they want to go. They are forceful about where they want to go. But I say that they are very wrong. It is a mean-spirited approach.

In fact, you can go further and say it is a dangerous and deadly approach because of its basic assumption that we cannot build an America that serves all people, we cannot have an America which provides freedom, peace, justice, and opportunity for everybody. The patterns that they are laying out is a pattern which says we can only do it for an elite oppressive minority.

The budget cuts are the center of this whole process of redefining what America is all about. The budget cuts are at the center of the vision that is being laid out by both groups. I think we should accept the challenge that is being laid down by the majority party in the House of Representatives.

A challenge that they are laying down is that they have a vision for the new world order, they have a vision as to where America should be going, and we would like to offer an alternative vision. I am the chairman of a Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget committee, and we are going to accept the challenge of offering an alternative budget, and that budget will be very much a vision of where we think America should be going between now and the year 2000 or 2002.

Certain rules are being made about how this budget is going to be handled. The rumor is that we cannot bring any alternative or substitute budget to the floor of the House unless that budget shows where we are going to balance the budget by the year 2002. If we cannot balance the budget by the year 2002, we will not be allowed to put it on the floor is the rumor. It has not been finalized yet.

Well, we accept that challenge. If we have to prepare a balanced budget by the year 2002, that is the only way we can present the Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative, then we will bring to the floor a budget which will be balanced by the year 2002, but in the process of balancing the budget we are going to demonstrate what the vision of a caring majority is. We are going to show how a budget can be balanced by making cuts of programs that are really not in the best interests of the great majority of Americans. The budget that we will bring forward will have the support of the great majority

of the American people because there is a caring majority.

The people who came out to vote on November 8 do not represent a mandate, did not offer a mandate, they do not represent a body on which a revolution can be based. We had about 38 to 39 percent of the people who were eligible to vote in America who came out, and half of those people voted for the party that won the majority. The half of 39 percent, 38 percent, is certainly not a majority of Americans. The Americans who did not come out to vote, in a large number who came out to vote and did not vote for the winners, they constitute the caring majority.

The caring majority is made up of people who are not wise enough to come out to vote and who did not protect their own interests in the proper way, but the caring majority also includes a lot of enlightened people who do vote and who do not identify with the policies of the elite oppressive minority who won the majority of the seats in the House. The caring majority is made up with people who are not necessarily homeless or do not even have the problem in getting shelter or buying homes, but they recognize that there are homeless people in America, and they want to see the America which provides the opportunity for everybody to have a decent home. They may not want to live next to homeless people, and that should not be the test of their compassion. The test of their compassion and their membership in the caring majority is do they believe that every American ought to have a decent home, an opportunity to have a decent home? A caring majority is made up of people who are not hungry, people who have plenty to eat and have good jobs, but the caring majority includes people who have good jobs, plenty to eat, who are willing to look at people who do not have jobs and do not have enough to eat, and they are willing to support public policies which are going to provide employment for all people. They are willing to support public policies which will allow everybody to earn an income and be able to provide the basic necessities of food, clothing, and shelter. The caring majority is made up of people like that who are voting and who will be on the side of those who are in need and who are being affected by the safety nets which are being removed by this oppressive elite minority.

We have a vision of America that is very different from the vision of the oppressive elite minority. We are not afraid to offer that vision.

On the other hand, we recognize that shortcomings of a vision of the elite minority, it is a vision of America for the few. It is a vision of America for the privileged. It is a vision of America for a new computer class. The cutoff is whether you can own a computer or not, I suppose from the kinds of language used by this oppressive elite minority. Traditional working class people

are not included in the vision of this elite minority as to who America should exist for.

They do not include construction workers, for example, who always are a part of the middle class. They made good salaries in the past, and they have been supported in the past by both parties. In fact, most construction workers a few years ago we would say would definitely fall in the Republican Party. They had that kind of outlook on life. They were part of the establishment, making very good salaries, and we are surprised and shocked that the new oppressive elite minority in control of this Congress is moving rapidly to take away basic benefits from construction workers. The repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act is high on the list, high on the agenda, of the oppressive elite minority/majority now in control of Congress. They do not want to see construction workers paid decent wages. They want to take out the Davis-Bacon Act which controls the situation which can easily be exploited if it is not there. They do not want to have much to do with organized labor in general.

Our great middle class, the greatest portion of the American middle class, have been working people traditionally. We created a phenomenon that never existed in the history of the world when we began to pay millions of workers decent wages. We created the great American market, the great American consumer market, which sustained this country and built our capitalism into the strongest system of democratic capitalism in the world. Everybody wanted to get into the American consumer market, and we have allowed in many cases too generously—we have been too generous in allowing the Japanese to get into the American consumer market, the Germans to get into the American consumer market, everybody comes along with products, rushers to the great American consumer market to sell products and to benefit greatly. Japanese riches have been built on that openness of our consumer market.

That consumer market would not exist if we had not had the American labor movement, if we had not had a situation where the forces combine, the workers themselves, and enlightened Government starting with FDR, and an acceptance by the Republican Party, acceptance by the corporations, that it was good to have labor peace, it was good to pay decent wages, and we went forward all together under that system.

But, no, we want to turn the clock back and stop that in this present Congress controlled by the oppressive elite minority. The oppressive elite minority's leadership right away took the Education and Labor Committee and changed the name. They wanted to immediately insult labor by taking labor out of the name of a major committee on Congress so we no longer have any committee of Congress that has the word "labor" in it. They proceeded to

move to repeal certain portions of the National Labor Relations Act. All kinds of things are moving forward to oppress and to squeeze the traditional middle class of working Americans, working Americans who do belong to the middle class. They want to redefine the middle class and push down those who before, who heretofore, have belonged to the great middle class.

Public education is now under attack by this oppressive elite minority. The leadership of this Congress, majority of this Congress, the leadership now wants to eliminate the Department of Education. They have gone after education programs with a large number of rescissions already before we get into the process of making the budget for next year. They want to pull back funds for large numbers of programs in this year. They propose first to cut Head Start, and then when they were forced to back away from that, they have cut title I programs. The most basic Federal aid to education is funneled through title I, formerly called chapter 1 programs. Public education is under attack, and after many years under Ronald Reagan and under President Bush, after years of recognizing that America had a problem with education, and after every President starting with President Reagan, attempted to move forward in some way to establish a Federal presence in education. We are now ready to recklessly retreat, recklessly eradicate all the work that has been done by Reagan, Bush, and Clinton and tear down the Federal involvement in education, just wipe out the Department of Education. We will be the only industrialized nation which does not have a centralized Department of Education to provide some guidance and some direction for the education function. We will rapidly begin to decline in our ability to compete once the Department of Education is gone.

But the oppressive elite minority is blinded by their own ideological biases, and they want to wipe out the effectiveness of public education. They are going to look to other ways to provide education, those that they think should be educated. The rest they will throw overboard, the billions of dollars. The riches of America will not be used for one of the most fundamental functions of society, the education of the populace. Nothing is more important to our national security than the education of the populace. The education of the American people will keep them competitive. The education of the American people will maintain civility and lessen friction, lessen crime, lessen disorder. The education of the American people is the most important function of Government as we go toward the new world order. Far more important in our national defense and our national security is education than new weapon systems.

But we define what we are all about, as I said before, by the steps we take in our policies and especially in our fiscal

policies, budget policies, and other monetary policies. The steps that are being taken now are clearly defining what I call a high tech, a group of high technology barbarians, well educated people who understand how to use information, but who lack compassion, and in the final analysis, because they lack compassion, they lack the vision necessary to carry us forward and build on the greatness that already exists in America. The vision of a caring majority is very different from the vision of the oppressive elite minority.

□ 2145

The vision of the caring majority sees the possibility of peace, justice and opportunity for all of the people. We do not see America going bankrupt. We do not want to preach scarcity. We are not Bangladesh. We have the resources necessary to provide for a society and an economy that can support peace, justice and opportunity for all of the people.

We can provide health care for all of the people. We can provide housing for all of the people. We can provide employment for all of the people. The resources are there.

The caring majority is there. And given the opportunity, we are going to find a rejection of the kind of policies and programs being put forward by this elite, oppressive elite minority.

Democratic capitalism allows us to do the kinds of things that are needed to produce a society with opportunity for all and with justice and peace. Democratic capitalism is a good umbrella, an umbrella under which we may construct the most successful social order ever created. The skeleton of Democratic capitalism has the ability. It is able to adapt.

The system is responsive to innovations. We are not stuck in a situation where we can look forward to going to a bankrupt treasury in the year 2000, because Social Security is there, if we do not take radical steps now to end spending for programs that benefit people.

The responsiveness is there. We can do a great deal of things under our present setup. We are the greatest system that has yet been devised by man. And we must use it with imagination and creativity. And most of all, we must have the compassion to understand that we do not need to throw any group of people overboard.

This is the first and the most vital step. Make the assumption that the richest Nation in the history of the world can create, it can generate a society which provides peace, justice and opportunity for all.

Now, am I running away from the hard job of discussing the budget? I have not mentioned very many numbers at this point. Let's talk about numbers, the problem of funding. The problem of money, of taxes, is a monumental problem today. It will be a monumental problem in the future. It is a permanent challenge. We will always have to struggle to produce the

revenues necessary to finance the activities and the functions of government and society that we deem are necessary. It is an ongoing problem. We will have to rise to the occasion.

We will always have to raise revenue. We will have to eliminate waste. We have to set the right priorities. We will always have to be improving efficiency and increasing effectiveness.

Any organization or any activity that has ever been devised by human kind has a problem with efficiency and effectiveness. It has a problem with waste. The species *Homo sapiens*, human kind, is not an administering animal. We are not naturally good administrators. Administration and management is something that human beings have to work at all of the time. It is a permanent, ongoing activity.

I am not going to say that there is not waste in the welfare program. I am not going to say there is no waste in the school lunch program. I am not going to say there is no waste in any function that is operated by government, just as there is tremendous amount of waste in the private sector. In fact, the private sector has shown us it can be the most wasteful and the most inefficient and the most corrupt sector of our society.

The savings and loans collapse, the savings and loan swindle, showed us how monumental waste and corruption and inefficiency can exist within the private sector. So mankind, *homo sapiens*, are no more effective in the private sector in administration and management than they are in the public sector. It is a problem that we have to confront.

Let us go forward and deal with new ways and deal with the problem of money. First, budget cuts. Am I afraid to talk about budget cuts? Do I think we should not cut the budget? There is no room in the budget for a downsizing and a decrease in expenditures? No, I would not take that position. There is a tremendous amount of waste in the budget. But we define ourselves and we show where our souls are when we make the choices as to what to cut.

Why are we going on and on, day in and day out, about the cutting of the school lunch program and there is no discussion of some cuts of the CIA and the intelligence budget? The CIA and the intelligence agencies have a secret budget. They will not even tell the American people what the budget is, yet estimates by all sources have placed it at no less than \$28 billion. The intelligence budget is no less than \$28 billion; probably more.

At a time like this in our history when there is no evil empire anymore and the Soviet Union is struggling just to exist, it cannot be an aggressor or threaten us in any way, why do we need a CIA budget of \$28 billion?

If the people who want to downsize government and want to streamline government, if they want to do it in order to give a tax cut, if they want to

do it in order to make sure that our children and our grandchildren do not have to pay all of these bills in the future, if they want to seriously and sincerely deal with those problems, then why are they not discussing a cut in the CIA and the intelligence budget? Why not cut it just in half?

You put zero in the budget for the summer youth employment program. That is bold and daring. They consider that bold and daring. I think it is an act of cowardice to cut the summer youth program for teenagers overnight, pull out the money and say it is zero this year and next year it will also be zero. I do not think that is an act of courage.

It would be an act of courage to say let's gut the CIA budget and the intelligence budget in half to \$14 billion. We will have 14 billion to distribute for these other programs or to go to the deficit or to give a contribution toward the tax cut.

CIA, who don't we cut it? Why are we discussing the school lunch program and not discussing the CIA and the intelligence agency?

Why are we discussing the school lunch program endlessly and not the *Seawolf* submarine; 2.1 plus billion dollars, \$2.1 billion to build a submarine that everybody admits we don't need at all? We don't need it to fight a war. It is only there to maintain the profits for the manufacturer at a certain level; to provide some jobs.

And if you want to take \$2.1 billion, you could provide twice as many jobs if the object is just to provide jobs. The object is to provide profits also for people who certainly do not need to be milking the American taxpayers for more profits.

So why not cut the *Seawolf* submarine? We are talking some heavy dollars when you talk about the CIA and the *Seawolf* submarine.

Why not cut the cheap electricity that that the people in the Northwest and the Midwest have from dams that are built by all of the taxpayers with all the taxpayers' money? There are some people who are paying one-half the price for electricity as my constituents are paying in New York. Do they deserve the bargain of one half the cost for their electricity? They are Americans just like everybody else. Why not market rates for everybody?

If you raise the payments of the people who are getting the bargain in electric use and raise it to market rates, and let the Federal Government take back that money that it invested in the dams and the water projects and distribute throughout all America and let us all benefit from it, let's all get a benefit of the efforts of our Federal Government. Why are we not discussing a cut or a retrieving of the bounty that the people of the Northwest and the Midwest have enjoyed all these years? People say they want government off of their backs and yet they are the beneficiaries of some of our big-

gest government programs for the longest number of years.

And how about the Department of Agriculture? We are not discussing the biggest welfare program in America. The longest-running and the most lucrative welfare program in America is the farm price supports.

The Department of Agriculture handed out \$16 billion plus just for farm price supports last year. Sixteen billion is about the same size as the program that feeds millions of children on welfare. But in our population, gentlewomen and gentlemen, we only have a farm family population of 2 percent. Only 2 percent of the total American population is still in the classification of farmers.

Most of the billions of dollars that we are handing to the farmers or to the agribusinesses goes to corporate agricultural business. Most of it goes to rich farmers. Tremendous amounts of money could be saved if we would take the rich farmers off of welfare.

In the State of Kansas, for example, in most of the rural counties, according to the New York Times, farm families that are there and farmers who are part of the program have averaged between \$20,000 and \$40,000 a year that is being handed to them every year for doing nothing. A \$20,000 to \$40,000 check that comes on top of all of the other money that they make.

And there is no means test. When you are trying to get aid for dependent children on welfare, you have to meet a means test. You have to show you do not own anything and you have no bank account. In the Department of Agriculture programs and the farm price support programs and the Farmer's Home Loan mortgages and all of these benefits that have been heaped on our agriculture sector for the last hundred years, you do not have to show any means test.

Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. I think that the American agricultural industry is the greatest industry in America. I think it is probably one of the most effective industries in the world. There is no other nation that begins to come close to the American farmers, the American agricultural industry, in feeding its population, the population of America.

It probably could feed a large sector of the total world if the economics were different. We have the capacity. Our Department of Agriculture has done a magnificent job. And the Department of Agriculture, the whole agriculture program in America, is a sterling example of what can be done by government. Government operated from one end of the spectrum to the other.

Government funded the land-grant universities. Government funded the experimental stations for agriculture. Government funded the county agents that took the results of the experimental stations to the farmers in the field; very effective use of science and

technology and for that reason, it is a hugely successful industry.

Now that agriculture is such a huge and successful industry, why are we continuing to have government play such a major role in agriculture? Why not have the government step out? They talk about abolishing the Department of Education. Why do we not downsize and streamline the Department of Agriculture? Do you know that the Department of Agriculture is the second largest bureaucracy in the Federal Government? It is second only to the Pentagon in term of the number of employees.

The Department of Agriculture, they have done a great job. It is a marvelous success story. Private industry can now take over. We could downsize the Department of Agriculture, set a means testing procedure so that it provides aid and assistance only to the farmers who are the poorest farmers. We could privatize part of the Department of Agriculture. There are a whole set of experimental programs, there are research grants, private industry could take that research and development function at this point and do a job just as well.

So, instead of continuing to discuss on and on the school lunch program, why do we not discuss the downsizing and the streamlining of the Department of Agriculture? Why do we not discuss the elimination of \$16 billion in farm price support payments; welfare for the farmers? Why do we not deal with the farmers on the dole?

Why do we not deal with cuts of the F-22 fighter plane? Why do we need an F-22 fighter plane which was originally projected to cost the American people \$72 billion. The F-22 fighter plane is manufactured in Marietta, Georgia. The F-22 fighter plane was originally projected to cost \$72 billion. We have paid out about 12 billion already for planes and we are projecting over the next six years about \$17 billion more in expenditures for F-22 fighters.

If you want to keep America from going bankrupt, if you want to keep our grandchildren from having to pay the debt, then cut items like the F-22 fighter.

□ 2200

If you need an F-22 fighter plane, it is the most sophisticated thing ever developed in fighter planes. But do we need it? No. The second most sophisticated fighter plane we already have. We own the second most sophisticated fighter plane. We do not need to have another one more sophisticated, because we are not our own enemy. The Soviet Union is not developing any more fighter planes. They are not developing fighter planes that would even contest the one that exists already. Why keep manufacturing a brandnew one called the F-22?

So let us save over the next 6 years \$17 billion that could be applied then to fund the Summer Youth Employment Program, to make certain there is no

shortfall in the School Lunch Program, to make certain we do not kick people out of nursing homes, to guarantee that we do not remove home care from people in great need. Let us go forward and examine all of these expenditures if we really are sincerely interested in the most effective and efficient budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple discussion, and I hope the American people are listening closely. Listen to the numbers. In addition to philosophy, it is very important that we understand the numbers. The numbers that are being poured into the defense budget are huge numbers: \$17 billion more for F-22 fighters, \$2.1 billion for another Seawolf submarine; \$28 billion for the CIA; B-2 bombers. We could go on. The majority in this House want to spend another \$50 billion for defense. The majority in this House want to spend another \$50 billion for defense, while they are telling us they must trim school lunches and they must make more efficient programs like Medicare and Medicaid.

Finally, we have new revenue options. Our vision, the caring majority vision versus the vision of the oppressive elite majority. Their vision is we are in a situation where America is on the verge of bankruptcy. To hear the elite, the oppressive elite minority Members talk, we are almost at the stage of Bangladesh. We cannot exist much longer if we continue to try to build a society which is there for everybody. We have to start dumping people overboard. We have to rein in the safety net. Even Ronald Reagan acknowledged that there is a safety net that is needed, that we are now about to dump. The high technology barbarians who are in charge now have no compassion for those people.

Yet, every day there are new developments which show that far from being bankrupt and far from having our resources exhausted, America, the Democratic capitalistic society, America has all kinds of new potential for producing revenues.

We have just realized \$9 billion by selling invisible frequency bands in the sky. Spectrums in the sky which you cannot even see have been sold to the tune of \$9 billion, and that process has not ended. By just selling the air over ourselves, we have made money. And in the future, of course, we can always tax the income that is made off of those operations as normally the profits are going to be taxed, any profits made. So we have generated out of nothing. It shows you do not need land. You can take the air and sell it. If you are a nation, the power of nationhood is that you own the air.

They used to own the land, and we have given away a lot of the land. That is a chapter in American history which was very successful. You gave away land, you produced free enterprise, and you made great millionaires and produced a middle class. We have done a lot of great things in the past. We have

given away too much in some cases. We have given away property that had minerals on it, up until very recently. We are still giving away property that has gold on it and we do not require that the people who mine the gold pay us a royalty and give us back some of the benefits of the lands that the Government and the people own. The people have to assert themselves, and the people are going to have to insist there can be no more nonsense on giving away public lands and not demanding that the public have some percentage of the profits realized from the minerals that we get from those public lands.

We could also gain more revenue if we would stop giving away the fruits of Federal and government research. Military research has spawned a whole host of hundreds of new products. We have not reached out and placed the royalty on those products to come back to the public Treasury. We have just given it away.

Many of you know, everybody knows of a few products. Television was really perfected by our government research, not just the famous product super glue, which everybody knows was developed by the space program. There are hundreds of products that were produced as a result of government research, and we, the people, who paid the bill to do the research, we get no benefit from those products. That is a source of revenue. We could reach out, and instead of worrying about going bankrupt and putting the elderly on the streets, out of nursing homes, cutting back on Medicaid and Medicare, cutting back on school lunch programs, let us be more creative about claiming what belongs to the people.

I am not in favor of new taxes on income. I am not in favor of new personal taxes. But there are ways to get revenue that we ought to closely examine, which have nothing to do with personal income taxes. There are all kinds of loopholes. At a later date we are going to list those loopholes. The Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget, we intend to close the loopholes that corporations live by in order to maximize their profits and escape paying a just share of the taxes. Corporate taxes, the share of the overall revenue burden borne by corporate taxes, has dropped drastically in the last 20 years. We need to get back to having the corporate world carry their share of the taxes.

I am going to yield in a few minutes to a colleague of mine, but I want to make it clear that we are talking about the overall program of the new majority in Congress. We are talking about the fact that the budget process, the rescissions that are now being made right now, the budget that is going to be brought to the floor in May, all of that is part of an overall grand design that is a design, of course, a distorted vision of America, being driven by high-tech barbarians who

have no compassion and are really on the wrong track when they conclude we cannot have an America which is for everybody. Contrasted with their position, the position of the oppressive elite minority is a position of the caring majority. We are going to produce a budget, the Congressional Black Caucus is going to produce a budget, which reflects a vision of the caring majority.

To talk more about budgets and the rescissions that are now at our doorstep, heartless, cruel decisions that are being made through this rescission process, is my colleague from Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Let me thank my colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, and thank him for a very reasoned, if you will, detailed presentation, and almost a journey, if you will, taking us through very evenly how we have wound up to be here on the House floor, and poised, if you will, to vote for a rescissions bill that is larger than any I have ever seen and I think this House has ever seen.

Congressman, you know the last rescissions bill was in 1981. It is interesting, as you have been speaking about the cuts, and I just simply had to join you because as I have reviewed this legislation, the fact that it hits at the very most vulnerable in our society gives me a great deal of discomfort.

Interestingly enough, we are at 5.4 percent in unemployment. The economy is going well. You made a very good point about tax cuts and whether or not those who would be classified as Democrats are against improving the economy or looking at tax cuts.

We are looking at, are concerned about being fair. I took time for a moment to just find out what the word "rescission" means in Webster's dictionary. It is an act of rescinding, to take away, to take back, annul, cancel, to make void by action of the enacting authority or the superior authority.

That is what we have. We have a negative. We have a taking away of something already authorized. We have a taking back. We have an annulling. We have a canceling, and we have a superior attitude against the children of this country, against the elderly of this country, against those who need affordable housing.

We seem to want to pull back from the States of this country after, I remember, a very extensive debate about unfunded mandates, and many were called upon to support this legislation as innovative and positive. But yet this legislation will clearly put on the cities and States the great needs of its people, and that is the need to in fact serve those who are most vulnerable.

If I might just simply say that the rescissions bill, as it is politely known, will cut to the bone many of the programs that you have just spoken about. Across the country, throughout my home State and right in my hometown of Houston, millions of children,

elderly and poor citizens will be devastated and forced to endure government-sanctioned hardships in order to provide extensive tax cuts.

Well, what does this boil down to? As though the unsettling dynamics and displacement of our rapidly changing global economy were not already bad enough when it comes to driving the widening wedge between America's economic haves and have-nots, now the have-nots have to worry about Uncle Sam cutting them off at the knees. I do not know what we are going to do, but I will simply share with my Republican colleagues who are constantly explaining that what they are doing is helping America.

Just read the headlines in the hometown papers like the Houston Chronicle that says "Do Not Short-Change Texas Children." These are not political activists who are seeking publicity. These are children advocates who realize that Texas alone has some 7.3 percent of the U.S. child population. It has a large number of the individuals that are infants, I think some 5 million or so children.

We have headlines from local papers saying "Do Not Play Politics with Hungry Children," from the El Paso Times. These are local people that are speaking. The GOP social agenda is flawed at best. Local people again.

We have got "The Republican Tax Cut Plan May Not Add Up." We know that it does not add up, because clearly it tends to take from those who can least afford it. That is why we are in trouble with school lunches and breakfasts, but more important, that is why we are in trouble with school-to-work programs and no summer jobs.

Here is one right out the mouths of Republican Congresspersons, "GOP Haste Laying Waste to Legislative Good Intentions." This is not the Democrats speaking, this is the Republicans. One Republican stated, "I have always been a little concerned about arbitrary deadlines. I do not think it contributes to sound legislating."

Well, it really has not, because it is helping those who need help the most.

So I think that we are moving toward hurting our children, and we are moving toward not even ensuring that children and workers and those who are in need can be best served.

But if we fancy ourselves a moral Nation, ought we not first look for efficiencies and cuts in programs and policies that generally serve the fortunate who have been blessed, and from whom a small sacrifice for the good of the whole would not be an undue burden?

Let me share with you the words of the late Hubert Humphrey, who was fond of reminding us of the moral litmus test.

Those who are in the dawn of life, the children, those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly, and those who are in the shadow of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker and my colleague, I wonder if anyone from the other side of the

aisle can in good conscience claim that this rescission package, taking back, canceling, does anyone any good.

This package cuts \$17 billion, and it is a package. These cuts are not to the mohair growers subsidy or tax break on vacation home mortgages. But they simply get at the crux of those who are in need.

Let me just simply tell you where they are coming from. Where do the GOP cuts come from? My colleague ably detailed for us. Here it is in graphic design, if you will. Sixty-three percent comes from low-income cuts, individuals who are in need, and then 37 percent from other cuts. It gets to the people who most are in need.

Where is the justice in this rescission plan when 69 percent of the so-called savings will go to pay for tax cuts at a time when the deficits are already too high?

We wonder about the tax-and-spend liberals. That is what folks have been calling those who are not listening. What about the borrow-and-spend Republican administrations that have quadrupled our debt?

It is important to recognize that we have a job to do here in the United States Congress, and, therefore, it is a shame that we are canceling out housing, 42 percent, work experience and job training, 14 percent, health, 10 percent, education, 9 percent, and 25 percent in other cuts. People who are simply looking for the opportunity that we say in this country we are giving them.

Then I might add, as we begin to look elsewhere, we find that we have got some 69 percent tax cuts. That is where the money is going, and then of course it is going to the FEMA relief. I am not speaking about those States that are in great need, and need this kind of aid.

We know that California has been in some severe bad weather at this time, but we would simply say, what about those who are in need for hunger and housing? What about those who are trying to make a better life? Do we not need to be of assistance to them?

Mr. OWENS. Would the gentlewoman yield for a minute?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. OWENS. I would like to underscore what the gentlewoman has just said. I wonder if the American people realize the tremendous amount of money they have given to take care of natural disasters over the past 3 or 4 years. For the hurricane in Florida, between \$6 billion and \$7 billion of taxpayers' money from all over America went to help the victims of the hurricane in Florida. The earthquake in California, floods, mud slides, we are talking about close to \$7 billion or \$8 billion just directed to California various natural disasters. The Midwest flood that took place a couple of years ago, \$6 billion of people from all over the country's money went to help take care of those disasters.

We recognize people who are the victims of natural disasters are in need

and therefore we come to their aid, and it is altogether fitting and proper for government to do this. But the people in our big cities who are the victims of a mismanaged economy which does not provide any jobs also have great needs and we ought to also look upon them in the same way and provide some kind of assistance on an ongoing basis without having to have these frequent reviews and without belittling people who are the victims of the economy and victims of the mismanagement of the economy.

We are all one people, and there is no reason why one kind of disaster and one kind of victimization should be treated in a different way from the other people who are also victims.

I hope we will take note of that. It is an involuntary stimulus. California did not make the earthquake happen but once the earthquake happened, they got an involuntary economic stimulus. Money was poured in to take care of that need. It also made the economy go again. That is just the way it happens. But we also have disasters of a different kind in our big cities, whether they are Houston, New York, or Newark, New Jersey. I just wanted to underscore that point.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The gentleman could not be more right, and he has made a very eloquent point. I wonder as the American people go about their business and some have said that this debate has caused a great deal of distortion. I think the American people are smarter than what we would give credit for, and, that is, appreciating the fact, again, that the government went into these places like Florida and California, and, by the way, they went into my State, the State of Texas, and in fact there are people in my community right now who are still in great need because of a very severe flood we had in early fall, and I am working to ensure that they can be made whole.

But if you can appreciate that kind of assistance from the Federal Government, then why do we hear from the Republicans how easy it is to cut now some \$17 billion from the devastation that occurs in people's lives, especially that they have been challenged to pick yourself up, get off welfare, become independent, and I can assure you, just like I am sure in your community, that I have met with welfare mothers.

We sat down at the table and broke bread together and talked about their life. There was not a one that either got pregnant because they were getting a welfare check, there was a one that wanted to be on welfare. They talked about self-esteem, they talked about getting a job, they talked about trying to be independent. That is lives that are devastated, people responsible for children, and they need the help of the Federal Government.

If I could just share with you for one moment to tell you how much we are hurting in Texas.

Mr. OWENS. If the gentlewoman would yield for a moment, I want to inquire of the Chair how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. OWENS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas and I will take the last 4 minutes. I just wanted to close out with a note and I neglected to put in before.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. See how good it is to be able to have time and it is also good to be able to share with those who are in need, and that is the problem we have here in the State of Texas.

This is a gentleman who has no ax to grind. He is our State comptroller, and he has already assessed that we lose about a billion dollars in this rescission package for the State of Texas. We lose some \$763.7 million in Medicaid. Therefore, those who are trying to get off welfare would not have health care, the elderly, the severely handicapped, 69 percent. Family nutrition programs, we are losing \$170.6 million, 15.5 percent, for our State.

Then there is AFDC, there is training, emergency assistance, 10 percent, we are losing \$118.6 million. Then school nutrition in particular, dealing with our school lunches and school breakfasts. By the way, I met with leaders of the local school community and they are just up in arms about the children who will come to their doors who are hungry, particularly the districts that serve at-risk children. We are talking about the national impact, but I know what it means. It is going to hurt the people in the State of Texas, people in the State of New York, people all over this country. The American people understand this. This rescissions package should go nowhere.

As I conclude, let me talk about, and you have worked so hard on the summer programs, summer job perhaps that I have been actively involved in in my community. We are getting ready to lose in FY 1995 and 1996, \$66.6 million in 1995 and \$66.9 million, 43,000 jobs each year, and in Houston, each year, 1995 and 1996, 6,000 jobs. It was already not enough just last summer, 8,000 youngsters showed up on the first day to sign up, with stories of pain and excitement at the same time, excitement of trying to get a job, and pain for the need of the money during the summer months, for rent for their families, for clothing for their families, to take care of younger brothers and sisters.

This is serious. I worked extensively with anti-gang measures in Houston, where there are some 3,000 gang members, drive-by shootings. This is what gets our children off the street. This is what prepares young adults for the 21st century, the opportunity to work. This changes their mind set.

So when we begin to talk about where we are today and your detailing of what we should be looking at with an alternative budget and fairly we can look at possibly tax cuts, possibly

downsizing different agencies, we do not reject that, I do not reject it. But I do reject taking from the most vulnerable and undermining a State that is trying so very hard to improve itself and to serve the people in that community. We must be the better one, the Federal Government, to be able to stand up with the moral fiber and fight for those who are in need.

I thank the gentleman from New York but I think that we must cancel out this rescissions package and ensure that we stand up against this kind of intrusion into the lives of American citizens.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman from Texas. I would like to underscore your last point. The defunding, the placing of zero in the budget for the summer youth employment project is probably one of the most cruel and dangerous and deadliest acts of this oppressive elite minority in control of the Congress now. It shows no vision. It betrays the very vital segment of our population that needs help the most.

They follow through on that, that zeroing the budget for the summer youth employment program with a \$210 million rescission of the National Service Program. The National Service Program is for a different set of youth but it is basically program-oriented toward young people.

The National Service Program is not a program of Bill Clinton, it is not a program that the Democrats fabricated 2 years ago and the Republicans stood on the sideline. I have been in Congress for almost 13 years and we have discussed a National Service Program for 10 of those 13 years. Both parties have come forward with proposals, both parties have worked together. Why do we all of a sudden have to throw overboard and destroy a program which it took 10 years of deliberation and planning to develop?

The National Service Program would receive rescissions of \$210 million out of the \$571 million that they have available for this fiscal year. That is taking \$210 million and leaving only \$365 million, crippling the program to such an extent that it would hardly be able to operate because it is just getting off the ground now.

And then there are bigger cuts coming in the budget that begins October 1 because the oppressive minority has made it quite clear that they want to destroy the National Service Program.

The American people have a right to know why. Why? We should challenge the high-technology barbarians and say, You cannot do reckless things like this, you cannot make reckless decisions, you cannot just disregard all reason without explaining to the American people why.

A rescission of this magnitude for the National Service Program would renege on the bipartisan congressional commitment of Americans who have already committed to serving their communities. Middle-class families

who work hard and play by the rules would be especially hard hit because many of the members of the AmeriCorps are middle class. We designed it so it would not just be a program where young people who are poor were involved. It cuts across all classes.

A year and a half ago, Congress mandated a 3-year phase-in for funding 100,000 AmeriCorps members. It called for 20,000 members to begin a year of service in 1994 and 33,000 in fiscal year 1995.

This rescission, this heartless rescission, would require the corporation to scale back existing programs already in place, cutting approximately 2,000 AmeriCorps members from the current level of 20,000 and 15,000 from the phase-in level which has already been authorized by Congress. The majority of those reductions would occur in those States with the most AmeriCorps members: New York, California, Texas, Pennsylvania, and Michigan.

Middle-class families with college-age members willing to serve their communities full-time for a full year who are counting on AmeriCorps to help them afford college educations would be especially hard hit if the congressional commitment is not kept.

We close with National Service, as just one more example. School lunch programs, summer youth employment programs, National Service programs, programs that would benefit all of America a great deal are being very hard hit by these heartless cuts.

On the other hand, the F-22 fighter plane is not touched, and neither is the Seawolf submarine and a huge number of other programs in the military budget.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for joining me, and I hope that Americans are listening. There is a vision offered by the oppressive elite minority and there is a vision offered by the caring majority. We will talk more about those visions in the future.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak unequivocally against the misguided, shortsighted, and unconscionable spending cuts proposed in H.R. 1158—the Republican rescissions bill—to be considered on the House floor on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

This rescissions bill, as it is politely known, will cut to the bone many programs that manage to maintain a minimal standard of living and health care for America's most vulnerable citizens.

Across the country, throughout my home State of Texas, and right in my hometown of Houston, millions of children, elderly, and poor citizens will be devastated and forced to endure Government-sanctioned hardships in order to provide extensive tax cuts.

That's what it boils down to, Mr. Speaker.

As though the unsettling dynamics and displacement of our rapidly changing, highly competitive global economy were not already bad enough when it comes to driving the widening wedge between America's economic haves and have-nots.

Now, the have-nots have to worry about Uncle Sam cutting them off at the knees.

What in the world have we come to?

How can those Americans, who enjoy some of the highest living standards in human history, possibly begin to justify their demand for tax cuts when fellow citizens, through no fault of their own, are relegated to lives of bare subsistence and, in many cases, much less than that?

How can Republicans rationalize rescissions, while at the same time proposing to reduce spending on the hugely successful, bipartisan WIC Program that for better than two decades has been providing basic, healthful nutrition for poor women, infants, and children?

While economists and sociologists of all political stripes are telling us that, to succeed in the information age of the 21st century, American workers must be better trained and educated than the once-celebrated production-line workers of the 20th century, how can Republicans tell us—with a straight face—that we ought to be slashing job training and education programs that serve both children and adults?

How will the Republican leadership explain to senior citizens living in our colder climates that the Low-Income-Heating Assistance Program [LHEAP] that has helped them pay their heating bills in the winter is being cut?

Though it's not politically popular to do so these days, I might remind this body that American tax burdens—for all income brackets—have been and remain among the very lowest of the industrialized, Western democracies.

Should American government at all levels continue to improve efficiency, cut spending for outmoded programs, and work very hard to keep taxes as low as possible? . . . Absolutely.

But, if we fancy ourselves a moral nation, ought we not first look for efficiencies and cuts in programs and policies that generally serve the fortunate who have been blessed and from whom a small sacrifice for the good of the whole would not be an undue burden?

The late Hubert Humphrey was fond of reminding us that the moral test of any government was in the way it treated "those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anyone from the other side of the aisle can in good conscience claim that their rescission proposals pass such moral muster.

I don't know how they could, Mr. Speaker, when their cold-hearted proposals call for more than \$17 billion of cuts.

And these cuts are not to mohair grower subsidies or tax breaks on vacation home mortgages.

No, Mr. Speaker, these cuts to the bone come from programs like child nutrition, public housing, basic health care, education, transportation and community development—all programs that the most needy among us depend on for a brighter future.

Who takes the hit from these Republican spending cuts?

The answer is clear.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a whopping 63 percent of the

GOP cuts—nearly \$11 billion in fiscal year 1995—will impact low-income Americans.

And where does the money go?

Well, Mr. Speaker, 31 percent does go to help citizens who have lost their homes and communities due to natural disasters like earthquakes and hurricanes, and few would argue that the Government should not assist these victims.

But what about the victims of our man-made disasters like inadequate urban and rural schools; like job flight from our inner cities; like employment, housing and banking discrimination?

Are we not similarly obligated, Mr. Speaker, to assist these citizens, as well?

Where is the justice in this rescission plan when 69 percent of the so-called savings will go to pay for tax cuts at a time when deficits are already too high?

But it is disingenuous for GOP leadership to blame "tax-and-spend-liberals" for all America's financial woes when in fact it was during 12 years of "borrow-and-spend" Republican administrations that our national debt quadrupled.

Mr. Speaker, both parties and both the President and Congress can share equally in the blame for our sorry status quo.

But we're not going to get anywhere, much less rebuild a solid foundation for America's future by polarizing and dividing its citizens.

To blame poor people for all our problems just to curry political favor is shortsighted, immoral, and potentially catastrophic.

How will we pay for the additional medical care that will be needed by children made sick due to lack of nutrition?

How will we provide for families made homeless due to cuts in public housing? Almost 25,000 families remain on waiting lists in my city—Houston, TX.

How will we protect ourselves from those who may turn to crime when denied educational opportunities and a real chance in the mainstream economy?

My colleagues from the other side are fond of their "dynamic budget scoring" that tries to predict future Government revenues based on the boost they think their tax cuts will give to the economy.

Well, what's good for the goose, Mr. Speaker * * *

Ought not my Republican colleagues be prepared to score their spending cuts in the same fashion?

Shouldn't we think intelligently about the medium- and long-term effects these rescissions will have on future budgets and on the very moral fiber of our American society?

So as not to be accused of undue hyperbole or attempting to govern by anecdote, I'd like to share with my colleagues and the American people some clinical analysis of the GOP rescission plan.

I represent the people of Houston in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

So in addition to looking at national figures for these rescission cuts, I'd like to start with this story from last Wednesday's Houston Chronicle.

"Funding Cuts Could Cost Texas Billions, Comptroller Warns" . . .

That's the headline of the story which goes on to quote Texas State Comptroller John Sharp.

Sharp foresees up to \$1.1 billion in cuts in four critical categories in the next 2 years that

would devastate needy people in Houston and throughout the State.

Let us examine some of the specific programs that would be cut under this bill.

One program that is critically important to young people is the Youth Summer Jobs Program. This program, which began 30 years ago, has worked very well and has always received bipartisan support.

Nevertheless, this rescission bill completely eliminates funding in fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996 for the Summer Jobs Program to the tune of \$1.6 billion nationwide.

During this 2-year period, more than 1.2 million kids in 650 communities will be left without summer jobs.

And without question, these jobs are extremely important to young people. In many instances, these jobs give them their first job opportunity and help them develop a good working ethic.

In addition, many young people use the money earned from these jobs to buy clothes and supplies for school.

Let us be clear about the effectiveness of this program . . . the Summer Jobs Program consists of real jobs, not "make-work" jobs.

In many cities and towns, no other jobs are available for young people. As I travel around my congressional district and around the country, teenage unemployment remains high—particularly in African-American and Latino communities.

We need the Summer Jobs Program now more than ever.

Let's look at how the elimination of this program will affect Texas and Houston. The State of Texas will lose \$66 million in fiscal year 1995 and nearly \$67 million in fiscal year 1996.

This translates into 43,000 summer jobs that will be lost in Texas in each of the 2 years.

During this period, the city of Houston will lose \$9.1 million in 1995 and 1996 and will lose 12,000 jobs over this 2-year period.

I urge my colleagues to preserve this program and continue providing adequate funding.

Another program that will experience a major reduction in spending under this bill is housing.

This bill makes a frontal assault on the poor and our Nation's cities. One program, the Community Development Block Grant Program, will suffer a spending reduction of \$350 million nationwide.

The CDBG Program is one of the largest sources of Federal assistance to States and local governments.

Most of this money is channeled directly to the local level, particularly metropolitan areas with large pockets of poverty and substandard housing stock.

These funds have been used to acquire and rehabilitate property, preserve historic structures, provide relocation assistance and enforce housing code violations.

For example, the State of Texas will lose \$19.9 million in community development block grant funds and the city of Houston will lose \$2.4 million.

Under this bill, public housing programs have also been targeted for major reductions. Funds for public housing modernization will be cut by \$36 million in Texas and \$3.8 million in Houston.

The State of Texas will also lose \$14.2 million in public housing operating subsidies while the city of Houston will lost \$1.9 million.

Decent and affordable housing for all Americans—families and individuals—is a basic building block for communities and our society at large.

We can no longer delay making housing a national and moral priority.

Health care for the poor is another area that will suffer greatly under this bill.

In addition to the unthinkable cuts to Medicaid—more than \$760 million in 2 years for Texas alone—I am most concerned by cuts to the National Health Service Corps.

This program is designed to award scholarships to students in the health professions in exchange for their agreement to spend 2 to 3 years in medically underserved areas.

Over the last 25 years, this program has helped meet the health care needs of millions of low-income Americans.

This GOP rescissions bill proposes a \$12.5 million cut in this program.

Through this program, the Community Health Center in Houston, known as Central Houston Action, and several projects at the Harris County Hospital District will be endangered.

There are currently 62 physicians in Texas who are participating in the National Health Service Corps . . . and it seems to me we ought to be looking to expand this program, not cut it.

Members of the last Congress chose not to undertake constructive health care reform . . . it remains to be seen whether or not this Congress will muster the political courage to try.

In the meantime, however, how can we possibly consider making cuts to one small program that we know works in bringing affordable, basic health services to millions of Americans in under-served regions?

Mr. Speaker, in many cases, the lives of these needy Americans literally hang in the balance.

I could go on all night citing other programs marked for cuts that have similarly critical impacts on millions of American lives and livelihoods.

And I could complain about the closed nature of debate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have employed with this bill and others thus far in this 104th Congress.

I could complain in detail about the amendments we Democrats sought to offer in an effort to protect vulnerable Americans, only to have them blocked out-of-hand by the Republican majority.

But I'll simply conclude, Mr. Speaker, with a final, heartfelt plea to all my colleagues with a conscience and a greater sense of obligation to America's future than that evidenced by the cuts in H.R. 1158.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this pernicious piece of legislation.

□ 2230

CLICHES AND THEMES IN POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue the colloquy begun 2 weeks

ago with the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] and, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that during that colloquy we talked about themes in politics and cliches in politics and the unfortunate fact that politics in America in the 1990's has become theme-driven.

You hear often the phrase, "They don't get it." Well, the problem, Mr. Speaker, is "They don't get it," so now the American taxpayer is going to get it, and I hope that what we have heard on this floor tonight and what we have heard in this country over the last few months has received the attention of the American people, because the American people, I think, need to hear what the opposition is saying about the Contract With America and the importance of themes like personal responsibility, stopping the micro management of the private sector from Washington, a return to true free enterprise in this country that runs throughout the Contract With America.

It seems the loyal opposition truly believes government does it better, and we on this side of the aisle sincerely believe individuals do it better, Mr. Speaker.

This new Congress is made up of people who are willing to take a stand, who are willing to challenge accepted assumptions in this country for the last 40 years, and as a result of the Contract With America, what do we get? We get stories about the 1950's, about Governors from the 1950's, about the fact you can no longer trust States in the 1950's, in the 1960's, in the 1970's, in the 1980's, in the 1990's. You just cannot trust the States.

We get gross misrepresentations of fact. We get misinformation. We get horror stories. We get phony numbers. We get scarce tactics. And, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], we get class warfare, because class warfare is the bottom line. It is what we hear time and time again, hour after hour, day after day, week after week on the floor of this House.

And an example is the School Lunch Program. Just this week, a few quotes: A Boston globe columnist wrote that the country is simply not too broke to feed poor schoolchildren. The food services director in Omaha, NE, for the west side community schools of Omaha, said it is unconscionable to allow more of our children to suffer from hunger in addition to the 12 million who do now; health and nutrition are not a priority in Washington, she alleged, quoting a Government estimate. She said school lunch funding would be cut by 17 percent.

Now, on the floor of this House, we have seen the real numbers tonight. We have seen the real numbers every day in the newspaper. The real numbers. Mr. Speaker, are that nutrition programs have been funded at a level \$4.3 billion for fiscal year 1994; under the Republican budget, they are projected to increase to \$6.78 billion in 1996, and to increase further to \$7.8 billion in the year 2000.

By eliminating the administrative costs, by cutting out the Federal middleman, by cutting out the Federal micromanager, we are giving more money to the States for nutrition programs. Those are the numbers. Those are the facts. And by the way, they are the true facts getting through to the American people, because the message coming from towns and cities and districts and counties and the people across this country back to Washington today is, "We are not buying that old class warfare anymore."

I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], I know you would like to comment on that, and I yield.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, I say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH], for yielding.

I guess the point I think that needs to be made in what is happening on the floor of this House, the changes that the new majority, the Republican Party, is wanting to make is that which is a return to local control and privatization of what we are doing right here in Washington right now, and I think that some of the basic messages of those who so desire a strong central government that reaches in and controls the lives of so many people is the basic message is you cannot trust anybody else but those on the floor of this House including the 2 of us, but not excluding 433 other Members of this House.

And I guess my comment is that, and to reinforce what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is saying, is that government is best done at the local level, and problem-solving is best done at the local level. I can take care of things much better in my district much better than the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] could, because he probably has never been to Fresno, probably has never been to my hometown.

Mr. EHRLICH. I intend to visit this year.

Mr. RADANOVICH. You will be there someday. But you have never been. But nobody knows my problems better than I do, and I believe nobody can solve my problems better than those elected officials in my district who are on the local and State level, and I think that in reference to the reference by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] to class warfare, it seems to be the defense of those who defend a strong central Federal Government that whenever people like us who are elected and come in and try to solve that problem, we get accused of being in favor of class warfare, being against the poor, being against the middle class, being for the rich, and I am a Republican, and, "I ain't rich."

But those seem to be the arguments that are posed here, and I cannot help but go back to two things. First is, there is a deep mistrust of local elected officials on behalf of the Democratic